

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16, and 20-25 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chiu et al. (Hereinafter "Chiu") U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121, in view of Shipley (Hereinafter "Shipley") U.S. Patent No. 5,634,114."

Of pending claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16, and 20-26, seven claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 14, 22, and 26 are independent. "Newly-added" claim 26 is actually dependent claim 2 rewritten in independent form. Dependent claim 2 was indicated as being allowable in the Office Action dated 09/05/2003; hence, it is believed that independent claim 26 should now be allowed. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 14, and 22 are addressed below.

I. The art of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious, either alone or in any combination, version usage based on indicator presence.

Chiu et al. does not appear to directly address version usage determination. Shipley determines version usage based on version number matching. See, e.g., figure 3, elements 20 and 10.

In contradistinction, certain claims determine version usage based on indicator presence.

Specifically, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious the following elements in conjunction with the other elements of their respective claims:

Claim 1: wherein the computer application program is configured to use the first version of the shared component and not the second version of the shared component when the computer application program is executed on the computer system based on the pointer indicator being present in the first logical directory.

Claim 14: an indicator stored in the first memory partition that, when present, indicates the existence of the first version of the shared component in the first memory partition . . . wherein the application program utilizes the first version of the shared component if the indicator is present.

II. The art of record neither anticipates nor renders obvious, either alone or in any combination, distinguishing shared components based on a local version.

Chiu et al. distinguishes between new versus old resource DLLs. See, e.g., figure 2, elements 22 and 24. Shipley distinguishes between different versions by version number. See, e.g., figure 3, elements 10, 11, 19, and 20.

In contradistinction, certain claims distinguish components based on at least a local version.

Specifically, no art of record, either alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious the following elements in conjunction with the other elements of their respective claims:

Claim 4: storing a local version of a shared program component in the first directory . . . installing a file that indicates to the application that the application should utilize the local version of the shared program component [...] . . . wherein the local version of the shared component is a functional component of the application that is compatible therewith.

Claim 5: detecting a local file [...] . . . in response to detecting the local file, utilizing the locally-stored version of the shared component that is stored in a first directory of the computer system instead of a global version of the shared component present in a second directory of the computer system.

Claim 9: storing a local version of a shared component in the first directory for execution with the computer application program

1 on the computer system [...] . . . wherein the computer
2 application program is configured to utilize the local version of
3 the shared component and not the other version of the shared
4 component when the computer application program is executed
5 on the computer.

6 Claim 22: a first directory that contains a pointer to a global version of
7 a shared component useable by a plurality of computer
8 programs . . . a second directory that contains a pointer to an
9 application program and a pointer to a local version of the
10 shared component . . . wherein the application program utilizes
11 the local version of the shared component when the application
12 program calls the shared component.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 Although each pending dependent claim includes additional element(s)
3 militating toward allowability, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent
4 claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their
5 respective independent claims.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

